arXiv:1409.6427v1 [math.CT] 23 Sep 2014

Pointwise extensions and sketches in bicategories

Ross Street *
Macquarie University, NSW 2109 Australia
<ross.street@mq.edu.au>

September 24, 2014

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 18D10; 18D05
Key words and phrases: bicategory; pointwise Kan extension; right lifting; cofibration; collage; lax limit.

Abstract

We make a few remarks concerning pointwise extensions in a bicategory which include the case of bicategories of enriched categories. We show that extensions, pointwise or not, can be replaced by extensions along very special fully faithful maps. This leads us to suggest a concept of limit sketch internal to the bicategory.

Contents

1 Extensions and liftings in a bicategory **2**

2 Pointwise extensions **2**

3 The enriched category example **5**

4 Sketches **8**

*The author gratefully acknowledges the support of Australian Research Council Discovery Grant DP130101969. This material was presented to the Australian Category Seminar at Macquarie University on 14 and 21 August 2013.

1 Extensions and liftings in a bicategory

We begin by recalling the concepts of extension and lifting as used, for example, in [13] and [19]. Let $\mathscr{M}$ be a bicategory. Consider a triangle



(1.1)

in $\mathscr{M}$. We say the 2-morphism ρ in (1.1) exhibits r as a *right extension* of f along j when pasting the triangle to 2-morphisms $\theta : g \Longrightarrow r$ provides a bijection between such 2-morphisms θ and 2-morphisms $\phi : gj \Longrightarrow f$. Then r is unique up to a unique isomorphism. We write $\hom_A(j, f)$ for a right extension of $f : A \longrightarrow X$ along $j : A \longrightarrow B$. To say every f has a right extension along j is to say the functor

$$\mathscr{M}(j, 1) : \mathscr{M}(B, X) \longrightarrow \mathscr{M}(A, X) \ ,$$

defined by precomposition with j, has a right adjoint ran_j; so $\mathrm{ran}_j f = \hom_A(j, f)$. If also $i : B \longrightarrow C$ then

$$\hom_A(ij, f) \cong \hom_B(i, \hom_A(j, f)) \ . \tag{1.2}$$

Left extensions in $\mathscr{M}$ are right extensions in $\mathscr{M}^{\mathrm{co}}$: we write $\mathrm{lan}_j f$ for a left extension of f along j.

Right liftings in $\mathscr{M}$ are right extensions in $\mathscr{M}^{\mathrm{op}}$. We write $\hom^B(m, n)$ for a right lifting of $n : X \longrightarrow B$ through $m : A \longrightarrow B$. If also $\ell : C \longrightarrow A$ then

$$\hom^B(m\ell, n) \cong \hom^A(\ell, \hom^B(m, n)) \ . \tag{1.3}$$

A *left preadjoint* for $n : X \longrightarrow B$ is a right extension $\hom_X(n, 1_X)$ of the identity 1-morphism 1_X of X along n. Left adjoints are particular left preadjoints: when $j \dashv j^*$, we have

$$j \cong \hom_A(j^*, 1_A) \ .$$

Left adjoints are sometimes called *maps*. A map $j : A \longrightarrow B$ with right adjoint $j^* : B \longrightarrow A$ is *fully faithful* when the unit $\eta_j : 1_A \Longrightarrow j^* j$ is invertible.

2 Pointwise extensions

Suppose $\mathscr{K}$ is a class of maps of $\mathscr{M}$ which is closed under composition and includes the identities. We regard $\mathscr{K}$ as a locally full sub-bicategory of $\mathscr{M}$. When regarding a morphism f of $\mathscr{K}$ as in $\mathscr{M}$, we write it as f_*. This situation, including the next definition, was studied by Richard Wood [20, 21].

Definition. If (1.1) is in $\mathscr{K}$, we say it is a *pointwise right extension* in $\mathscr{K}$ when it is a right extension in $\mathscr{M}$. So

$$r \cong \hom_A(j_*, f) \ . \tag{2.4}$$

With this definition, the first proposition is obvious.

Proposition 1. *If* (1.1) *is a pointwise right extension in* $\mathscr{K}$ *then it is a right extension in* $\mathscr{K}$*.*

Proposition 2. *If* (1.1) *is a pointwise right extension in* $\mathscr{K}$ *and* j *is fully faithful then* ρ *is invertible.*

Proof. The right extension of r through j^* is rj. Using (1.2), we see that rj is the right extension of f through $j^*j_* \cong 1_A$. The right extension through an identity is the same 1-morphism. So $rj \cong f$. One of the adjunction identities for $j_* \dashv j^*$ shows that this isomorphism is ρ. □

A 1-morphism $j : B \longrightarrow C$ is called a *cofibration* when each $\mathscr{M}(j, X) : \mathscr{M}(C, X) \longrightarrow \mathscr{M}(B, X)$ is a fibration in the bicategorical sense of [17]. A 1-morphism $i : A \longrightarrow C$ is called a *coopfibration* when each $\mathscr{M}(i, X) : \mathscr{M}(C, X) \longrightarrow \mathscr{M}(A, X)$ is an opfibration in the bicategorical sense of [17].

If $u : A \longrightarrow B$ is a 1-morphism of $\mathscr{K}$, an object X is *u-complete* when every $f : A \longrightarrow X$ has a pointwise right extension along u. In that case, if $\mathscr{M}$ admits right extensions, the adjunction

$$\mathscr{M}(u_*, 1) \dashv \hom_A(u_*, -) : \mathscr{M}(A, X) \longrightarrow \mathscr{M}(B, X)$$

restricts to an adjunction

$$\mathscr{K}(u, 1) \dashv \mathrm{ran}_u : \mathscr{K}(A, X) \longrightarrow \mathscr{K}(B, X) \ .$$

A *collage* or *lax colimit* [18] of $j : A \longrightarrow B$ in $\mathscr{M}$ is a universal 2-morphism



(2.5)

That is, pasting with ν determines an equivalence of categories

$$\mathscr{M}(\mathrm{C}(j), X) \simeq \mathscr{M}(j, X)/\mathscr{M}(A, X) \ , \tag{2.6}$$

where the slice category on the right-hand side is the comma category [11] of the functor $\mathscr{M}(j, X)$ and the identity functor of $\mathscr{M}(A, X)$.

Proposition 3. *In the collage (2.5), the 1-morphism i_0 is a map with invertible unit $1_B \cong i_0^* i_0$, and with $i_0^* i_1 \cong j$ compatibly with $t\nu$. If $\mathscr{M}$ has local initial objects, preserved by composition with each given 1-morphism, and if i_1 is a map, then the unit $1_A \cong i_1^* i_1$ is invertible. Furthermore, i_0 is a cofibration and i_1 is a coopfibration.*

Examples in [18] suggest consideration of the following properties of a collage.

Definition. We say that a collage (2.5) is *$\mathscr{K}$-compatible* when

1. i_0 and i_1 are in $\mathscr{K}$,
2. for any $h : \mathrm{C}(j) \longrightarrow X$, if hi_0 and hi_1 are in $\mathscr{K}$, so is h, and
3. the mate triangle



(2.7)

exhibits $\mathrm{C}(j)$ as a lax limit of j in $\mathscr{M}$.

From the universal property (2.6), the triangle (1.1) induces a 1-morphism $\langle r, \rho \rangle : \mathrm{C}(j) \longrightarrow X$ and invertible 2-cells $f \cong \langle r, \rho \rangle i_1$ and $r \cong \langle r, \rho \rangle i_0$ which conjugate $\langle r, \rho \rangle \nu$ to give ρ.

Now consider the triangle



(2.8)

Proposition 4. *In $\mathscr{M}$, triangle (2.8) exhibits $\langle r, \rho \rangle$ as a right extension of f along i_1 if and only if triangle (1.1) exhibits r as a right extension of f along j.*

Proof. There is a right extension



(2.9)

coming from the adjunction $i_0 \dashv i_0^*$. If (2.8) is a right extension, we just paste the right extension (2.9) to the right side of it and use the isomorphisms $i_0^* i_1 \cong j$ and $\langle r, \rho \rangle i_0 \cong r$ to see that (1.1) is a right extension.

Conversely, take $h : \mathrm{C}(j) \longrightarrow X$ and $\theta : hi_1 \Longrightarrow f$. By the universal property (2.6) of $\mathrm{C}(j)$, in order to give a 2-morphism $h \Longrightarrow \langle r, \rho \rangle$, we precisely require two

2-morphisms $\theta : hi_1 \Longrightarrow f$ and $\phi : hi_0 \Longrightarrow r$ such that $\theta(h\nu) = \rho(\phi j)$. However, each θ determines such a unique ϕ by the right extension property of (1.1). So (2.8) is a right extension. □

Now by applying Proposition 4 to triangle (1.1) thought of as in $\mathscr{M}^{\mathrm{coop}}$, we obtain a pointwise version.

Corollary 5. *Suppose the triangle* (1.1) *is in* $\mathscr{K}$. *If* (2.8) *exhibits* $\langle r, \rho\rangle$ *as a pointwise right extension of* f *along* i_1 *then* (1.1) *exhibits* r *as a pointwise right extension of* f *along* j. *If the collage* (2.5) *is* $\mathscr{K}$*-compatible then the converse also holds.*

Definition. A square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S & \xrightarrow{p} & U \\ {\scriptstyle q}\downarrow & \overset{\lambda}{\Longleftarrow} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle b} \\ A & \xrightarrow[j]{} & B \end{array} \tag{2.10}$$

in $\mathscr{K}$ is called *BC* or, by René Guitart [6], *exact* when its mate square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S & \xrightarrow{p} & U \\ {\scriptstyle q^*}\uparrow & \overset{\overline{\lambda}}{\Longrightarrow} & \uparrow{\scriptstyle b^*} \\ A & \xrightarrow[j]{} & B \end{array} \tag{2.11}$$

in $\mathscr{M}$ has $\overline{\lambda}$ invertible.

Proposition 6. *If the triangle* (1.1) *is a pointwise right extension and the square* (2.10) *is BC then the 2-morphism obtained by pasting the square on top of the triangle exhibits* rb *as a right extension of* fq *along* p.

Proof. Take $h : U \longrightarrow X$. Then $\theta : hp \Longrightarrow fq$ are in bijection with $pq^* \Longrightarrow h^*f$ which, by the BC property, are in bijection with $b^*j \Longrightarrow h^*f$, and so with $hb^*j \Longrightarrow f$. By the pointwise right extension property of (1.1), these are in bijection with $hb^* \Longrightarrow r$, and so, by mates, with $\phi : h \Longrightarrow rb$. Then λ, ρ and ϕ paste to give back θ, as required. □

3 The enriched category example

Let $\mathscr{V}$ be a base monoidal category as used in [7]. For two-sided modules (also called bimodules, profunctors and distributors) refer to [10], [18] and [3], for example.

Let $\mathscr{V}$-Mod be the bicategory whose objects are $\mathscr{V}$-categories $\mathscr{A}$ (which are small relative to $\mathscr{V}$), whose 1-morphisms are two-sided modules $M : \mathscr{A} \longrightarrow \mathscr{B}$ and whose 2-morphisms are module morphisms. We have an equivalence of categories

$$\mathscr{V}\text{-Mod}(\mathscr{A}, \mathscr{B}) \simeq [\mathscr{B}^{\mathrm{op}} \otimes \mathscr{A}, \mathscr{V}] \ . \tag{3.12}$$

The composite $N \circ M$ of modules $M : \mathscr{A} \longrightarrow \mathscr{B}$ and $N : \mathscr{B} \longrightarrow \mathscr{C}$ is defined by the coend formula:

$$(N \circ M)(C, A) = \int^{B} M(B, A) \otimes N(C, B) \ . \tag{3.13}$$

Notice that the hom categories (3.12) are cocomplete and composition is separately colimit preserving (local cocompleteness). Indeed, right liftings and right extensions all exist in $\mathscr{V}$-Mod. In particular, we have



(3.14)

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hom_{\mathscr{A}}(M, N)(X, B) &= \int_{A} [M(B, A), N(X, A)] \\ &\cong [\mathscr{A}^{\mathrm{op}}, \mathscr{V}](M(B, -), N(X, -)) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

Each $\mathscr{V}$-functor $F : \mathscr{A} \longrightarrow \mathscr{B}$ determines modules $F_* : \mathscr{A} \longrightarrow \mathscr{B}$ and $F^* : \mathscr{B} \longrightarrow \mathscr{A}$ defined by $F_*(B, A) = \mathscr{B}(B, FA)$ and $F^*(A, B) = \mathscr{B}(FA, B)$. In $\mathscr{V}$-Mod, we have an adjunction $F_* \dashv F^*$; that is, the F_* are some of the maps in $\mathscr{V}$-Mod.

We identify the 2-category $\mathscr{V}$-Cat of $\mathscr{V}$-categories, $\mathscr{V}$-functors and $\mathscr{V}$-natural transformations with the sub-bicategory of $\mathscr{V}$-Mod by restricting to modules of the form $F_* \dashv F^*$.

So in Section 1, if we take $\mathscr{M} = \mathscr{V}$-Mod then $\mathscr{V}$-Cat provides us with a suitable sub-bicategory $\mathscr{K}$.

In this context, a triangle



(3.16)

in $\mathscr{V}$-Cat exhibits R as a pointwise right extension of F along J in the sense of Section 2 if and only if it does in the usual sense for enriched category theory (see [4] or [7]). That is,

$$R_* \cong \hom_{\mathscr{A}}(J_*, F_*) \ , \tag{3.17}$$

or

$$\mathscr{X}(X, RB) \cong [\mathscr{A}^{\mathrm{op}}, \mathscr{V}](\mathscr{B}(B, J-), \mathscr{X}(X, F-)) \ . \tag{3.18}$$

The collage



(3.19)

of a module M is constructed as follows (see [17]). The $\mathscr{V}$-category $\mathrm{C}(M)$ contains $\mathscr{A}$ and $\mathscr{B}$ as disjoint full sub-$\mathscr{V}$-categories with inclusion $\mathscr{V}$-functors i_1 and i_0. There are no other objects. We have

$$\mathrm{C}(M)(i_0 B, i_1 A) = M(B, A)$$

and

$$\mathrm{C}(M)(i_1 A, i_0 B) = 0 \ ,$$

where 0 is initial in $\mathscr{V}$. Composition is obtained from composition in $\mathscr{A}$ and $\mathscr{B}$, and from their actions on M. This collage is $\mathscr{V}$-Cat-compatible; see [18] for the lax limit property coming from local cocompleteness of $\mathscr{V}$-Mod.

Given a span $\mathscr{A} \xleftarrow{Q} \mathscr{S} \xrightarrow{P} \mathscr{U}$ in $\mathscr{V}$-Cat, it follows easily that its cocomma square is

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathscr{S} & \xrightarrow{\quad P \quad} & \mathscr{U} \\ {\scriptstyle Q}\downarrow & \xleftarrow{\ \lambda\ } & \downarrow{\scriptstyle i_0} \\ \mathscr{A} & \xrightarrow[i_1]{} & \mathrm{C}(P_* \circ Q^*) \end{array} \tag{3.20}$$

where λ is the mate of the ν in the collage.

As a simple application of the coend form of the enriched Yoneda Lemma (see [7]), we have the following.

Proposition 7. *Cocomma squares* (3.20) *are BC.*

Proof. Put $\mathscr{B} = \mathrm{C}(P_* \circ Q^*)$. By Yoneda we have

$$i_0^* \circ i_{1*}(U, A) = \int^B \mathscr{B}(B, i_1 A) \otimes \mathscr{B}(i_0 U, B) \cong \mathscr{B}(i_0 U, i_1 A) = P_* \circ Q^*(U, A) \ ,$$

as required. □

For ordinary categories, we have a dual which explains the definition of pointwise right extension used in [13].

Proposition 8. *For $\mathscr{V} =$ Set, comma squares are BC.*

Proof. Consider the comma square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B/J & \xrightarrow{\quad D_0 \quad} & \mathscr{U} \\ {\scriptstyle D_1}\downarrow & \xleftarrow{\ \lambda\ } & \downarrow{\scriptstyle B} \\ \mathscr{A} & \xrightarrow[J]{} & \mathscr{B} \ . \end{array} \tag{3.21}$$

The mate of λ is the 2-morphism $D_{0*} \circ D_1^* \longrightarrow B^* \circ J_*$ with component

$$\int^{(V, \beta : BV \to JX, X)} \mathscr{A}(X, A) \times \mathscr{U}(U, V) \longrightarrow \mathscr{B}(BU, JA)$$

at (U, A) the function whose composite with the injection $\mathrm{in}_{(V,\beta,X)}$ at the object $(V, \beta : BV \to JX, X)$ of B/J is the function

$$\mathscr{A}(X, A) \times \mathscr{U}(U, V) \longrightarrow \mathscr{B}(BU, JA)$$

taking $(\alpha : X \to A, \upsilon : U \to V)$ to the composite

$$BU \xrightarrow{B\upsilon} BV \xrightarrow{\beta} JX \xrightarrow{J\alpha} JA\ .$$

By a familiar argument with tensor products, the function

$$\mathscr{B}(BU, JA) \longrightarrow \int^{(V,\beta:BV\to JX,X)} \mathscr{A}(X, A) \times \mathscr{U}(U, V)\ ,$$

taking $\beta : BU \to JA$ to $\mathrm{in}_{(U,\beta,A)}(1_U, 1_A)$, gives an inverse to the mate of λ. □

4 Sketches

Sketches on a category were introduced by Charles Ehresmann [5], extending Grothendieck topologies [1] and Lawvere theories [9]. We generalize to sketches on an object in our bicategorical setting, improving on [16].

Definition. A *sketch* $\mathbb{T}$ on an object C is a triangle



(4.22)

in $\mathscr{K}$ where u is a fully faithful coopfibration.

A *model* of $\mathbb{T}$ in X is a 1-morphism $f : C \longrightarrow X$ in $\mathscr{K}$ such that $f\tau$ exhibits fw as a pointwise right extension of fv along u. In particular, $f\tau$ is invertible. Write $\mathrm{Mdl}(\mathbb{T}, X)$ for the full subcategory of $\mathscr{K}(C, X)$ consisting of these models.

Proposition 9. *If X is u-complete then* $\mathrm{Mdl}(\mathbb{T}, X)$ *is the inverter of the natural transformation*

$$\overline{\mathscr{K}(\tau, 1)} : \mathscr{K}(w, 1) \Longrightarrow \mathrm{ran}_u \mathscr{K}(v, 1) : \mathscr{K}(C, X) \longrightarrow \mathscr{K}(B, X)$$

which is the mate of $\mathscr{K}(u, 1)\mathscr{K}(w, 1) \cong \mathscr{K}(wu, 1) \overset{\mathscr{K}(\tau,1)}{\Longrightarrow} \mathscr{K}(v, 1)$.

Now suppose $\mathscr{M}$ is a monoidal bicategory and that $\mathscr{K}$ is closed under the monoidal structure: that is, if $f : A \longrightarrow B$ and $g : C \longrightarrow D$ are 1-morphisms of $\mathscr{K}$ then $f \otimes g : A \otimes C \longrightarrow B \otimes D$ is in $\mathscr{K}$. Moreover, we suppose $\mathscr{K}$ is closed with internal hom $[A, B]$.

We say that X is *pointwise u-complete* when it is $(1_K \otimes u)$-complete for every object K.

Notice that, for 1-morphisms u and h in $\mathscr{K}$, we have a BC square:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H \otimes A & \xrightarrow{1\otimes u} & H \otimes B \\ {\scriptstyle h\otimes 1}\downarrow & \cong & \downarrow{\scriptstyle h\otimes 1} \\ K \otimes A & \xrightarrow[1\otimes u]{} & K \otimes B \ . \end{array} \tag{4.23}$$

It follows that, if X is pointwise u-complete, then

$$\mathrm{ran}_u : \mathscr{K}(K \otimes A, X) \longrightarrow \mathscr{K}(K \otimes B, X)$$

is pseudonatural in K and so transports to a pseudonatural transformation

$$\mathscr{K}(K, [A, X]) \longrightarrow \mathscr{K}(K, [B, X]) \ .$$

By the bicategorical Yoneda lemma [17], this last transformation is induced by a 1-morphism

$$\mathrm{r}_u : [A, X] \longrightarrow [B, X]$$

which is right adjoint to

$$[u, 1] : [B, X] \longrightarrow [A, X]$$

in $\mathscr{K}$.

Proposition 10. *If X is pointwise u-complete then the inverter* $\mathrm{mdl}(\mathbb{T}, X)$ *of the 2-morphism*

$$\overline{[\tau, 1]} : [w, 1] \Longrightarrow \mathrm{r}_u[v, 1] : [C, X] \longrightarrow [B, X] \ ,$$

which is the mate of $[u, 1][w, 1] \cong [wu, 1] \overset{[\tau,1]}{\Longrightarrow} [v, 1]$, satisfies the pseudonatural equivalence

$$\mathrm{Mdl}(\mathbb{T}, [K, X]) \simeq \mathscr{K}(K, \mathrm{mdl}(\mathbb{T}, X)) \ .$$

References

[1] Michael Artin, *Grothendieck topologies*, (Harvard University, Dept. Math., 1962).

[2] Jean Bénabou, *Introduction to bicategories*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **47** (Springer-Verlag, 1967) 1–77.

[3] Brian J. Day and Ross Street, *Monoidal bicategories and Hopf algebroids*, Advances in Math. **129** (1997) 99–157.

[4] Eduardo J. Dubuc, *Kan extensions in enriched category theory*, Lecture Notes in Math. **145** (Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York 1970) xvi+173 pp.

[5] Charles Ehresmann, *Esquisses et types des structures algébriques*, Bul. Inst. Politehn. Iaşi (N.S.) **14(18)** (1968 fasc. 1-2) 1–14.

[6] René Guitart, *Relations et carrés exacts* Ann. Sci. Math. Québec **4(2)** (1980) 103–125.

[7] G. Max Kelly, *Basic concepts of enriched category theory*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series **64** (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982).

[8] G. Max Kelly and Ross Street, *Review of the elements of 2-categories*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **420** (Springer-Verlag, 1974) 75–103.

[9] F. William Lawvere, *Functorial Semantics of Algebraic Theories*, Proc. Nat. Ac. Sc. **50** (1963) 869–872.

[10] F. William Lawvere, *Metric spaces, generalized logic and closed categories* Reprints in Theory and Applications of Categories **1** (2002) 1–37.

[11] Saunders Mac Lane, *Categories for the Working Mathematician*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **5** (Springer-Verlag, 1971).

[12] Ross Street, *The formal theory of monads*, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra **2** (1972) 149–168.

[13] Ross Street, *Fibrations and Yoneda's lemma in a 2-category*, Lecture Notes in Math. **420** (1974) 104–133.

[14] Ross Street, *Elementary cosmoi I*, Lecture Notes in Math. **420** (1974) 134–180.

[15] Ross Street, *Limits indexed by category-valued 2-functors*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **8** (1976) 149–181.

[16] Ross Street, *Complete objects relative to a theory* (preprint, June 1976, http://maths.mq.edu.au/~street/Sketch.pdf)

[17] Ross Street, *Fibrations in bicategories*, Cahiers de topologie et géométrie différentielle **21** (1980) 111–160..

[18] Ross Street, *Cauchy characterization of enriched categories*, Reprints in Theory and Applications of Categories **4** (2004) 1–16.

[19] Ross Street and R.F.C. Walters, *Yoneda structures on 2-categories*, J. Algebra **50** (1978) 350–379.

[20] Richard J. Wood, *Abstract proarrows I*, Cahiers Topologie Géom. Différentielle **23(3)** (1982) 279–290.

[21] Richard J. Wood, *Proarrows II*, Cahiers Topologie Géom. Différentielle Catég. **26(2)** (1985) 135–168.